UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,223	12/15/2003	Venkat Selvamanickam	1014-SP165-US	3138

34456 7590 03/31/2006

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLPL.L.P.
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE
SUITE 200
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER	
TALBOT, BRIAN K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1762	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,223	SELVAMANICKAM, VENKAT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian K. Talbot	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 February 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *15* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/21/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-14, in the reply filed on 2/3/06 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the subject matter of the groups is not independent and distinct and that different classification is not a reason for distinctness as the Office historically has examined cases with different claims. This is not found persuasive because the claims are directed toward distinct inventions which have acquired a separate status in the art as well as the fact that the issues that arise in examining process and article claims are different and this would constitute a burden on the Patent Office.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Hence, claims 15 is withdrawn and claims 1-14 remain active in the application. Cancellation of withdrawn claim 15 is requested in response to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the phrase "precursor conversion and film growth zone" is unclear. Are there two separate zones or is there only one zone where both occur? Clarification is requested.

In claim 6, the term "the coating step" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 8, the term "the partial pressure of water vapor" lacks antecedent basis.

In claims 9 and 11, the term "carrier gas" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 10, the term "the partial pressure of the oxygen and water vapor" lacks antecedent basis.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With regards to claim 12 and Fig. 2, the claim recites a showerhead having a length at least as great as the width. This is not depicted in Fig. 2 not described in the specification. The showerhead has a width at least as wide as the widths of the tapes and the distances between them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597).

Weismann et al. (6,794,339) teaches synthesis of YBCO using sub-atmospheric processing. Weismann et al. (6,794,339) teaches forming crystalline YBCO that includes forming a precursor film and heat treating at a temperature above 500°C in the presence of oxygen, nitrogen and water vapor at sub atmospheric pressures (abstract). Weismann et al. (6,794,339) teaches water vapor pressures of up to 25 Torr as well as a carrier gas such as nitrogen with the addition of oxygen (col. 2, lines 5-15). By product are swept out of the chamber in a more efficient manner (col. 2, lines 50-60). The growth rate ranges from 1-20 angstroms per second (col. 4, lines 20-22). The substrates on which the superconducting films are deposited on include nickel coated with a buffer of cerium oxide (col. 7, lines 10-20). Sub-atmospheric pressure of 1-760 Torr are utilized in the processing chamber (Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 35-45.

Weismann et al. (6,794,339) fails to teach this process utilized in coating tapes.

DeBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) teaches production of oxidic superconductors by zone oxidation of a precursor alloy. This oxidation post-treatment can be performed on a variety of substrate shapes including tapes, ribbons and wire (abstract, Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 1-15).

Yoshida (5,206,216) teaches a method of fabricating oxide superconducting wires by laser ablation. The superconducting coating is applied to wires or tap-like substrates and post-treated in an oxygen atmosphere to form the superconductor coating (abstract and Fig. 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Weismann et al. (6,794,339) process by utilizing the process to form superconducting materials in tape/ribbon form as evidenced by deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) with the expectation of achieving similar success.

Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) fail to teach the use of a showerhead to supply the oxygen/water vapor.

Lee et al. (2004/0163597) teaches the conventionality of supply "forming gases" by a showerhead including oxygen to a substrate to form a superconductive film ([0003]-[0004]).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) process by incorporating showerhead to supply the oxygen/water vapor as evidenced by Lee et al. (2004/0163597) with the expectation of achieving similar success.

With respect to claim 13 which recites a pumping system to remove by-products, it is noted that Weismann et al. (6,794,339) teaches by product being swept out of the chamber in a more efficient manner (col. 2, lines 50-60) and hence, the addition of a pumping system to perform this function would be within the skill of one practicing in the art.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) further in combination with Manabe et al. (6,774,088) or Weinstein (6,083,885).

Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) fail to teach the processing chamber having a dew point between 40-80°C.

Manabe et al. (6,774,088) teaches a rare earth barium copper compositions and method of producing superconductors. Manabe et al. (6,774,088) teaches dew point temperatures of 80oC when heating the superconducting precursor to form the superconductor. This can be done in reduced pressure (col. 4, lines 40-65 and Examples 2,4).

Weinstein (6,083,885) teaches method of forming textured high temperature superconductors. Weinstein (6,083,885) teaches REBCO superconductors where the precursors are heated in an oxygen atmosphere with a dew point in the range of 20°C-75°C (col. 11, lines 10-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the tie the invention was made to have modified Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) process by performing the post-treatment having a dew point as claimed as evidenced by Manabe et al. (6,774,088) or Weinstein (6,083,885) with the expectation of achieving similar success.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) further in combination with Ott et al. (5,278,138).

Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) fail to teach the processing chamber being a cold-walled chamber.

Ott et al. (5,278,138) teaches an aerosol CVD deposition of a metal oxide film. The metal oxide film can be superconductive coating such as YBCO (col. 3, lines 15-35). The reactors for which the process can take place include both cold-wall and hot-wall reactors (col. 5, lines 50-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Weismann et al. (6,794,339) in combination with either deBarbadillo, II et al. (4,962,085) or Yoshida (5,206,216) further in combination with Lee et al. (2004/0163597) process chamber to be a cold-wall chamber as evidenced by Ott et al. (5,278,138) with the expectation of achieving similar success.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

B K Talbot 3/27/06

Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT